

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is hereby requested. Claim 20 has been amended to depend from Claim 18 and the language has been clarified to provide an antecedent basis. Therefore, reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

As stated in the Office Action, Claim 13 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 13 and is now in condition for allowance, and such is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-12 and 14-20 depend from Claim 1 and are considered to allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1 and for their own limitations as well, and such is respectfully requested.

Claim 13 has been amended to depend from Claim 21.

Please add Claims 21-22.


Claim 21 includes the subject matter of Claims 1 and 11. Claim 22 includes the subject matter of Claims 1 and 12. Claims 21 and 22 are considered allowable because each of the claims designate a structure and do not state a process step. While a structure does result from a process, Claims 21 and 22 do not claim a process step. In Claim 21, the dropper is monolithic. In Claim 22, the dropper is blow-molded. The applied prior art does not teach medicine droppers that are monolithic or blow-molded. The word “monolithic” is defined in Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary, Third Edition as, inter alia, “2a: cast as a single piece b: formed or composed of a material without joints or seams c: consisting of or constituting a single unit”. And, in applied prior art reference Clifford et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,814,265) at col. 3, lines 15-17, it states: “[F]ront housing 24, upper rear housing 26, and lower rear housing 28 are preferably formed from molded plastic and snap fit together”. Thus, Clifford et al. teaches away from a device being monolithic and Clifford et al. does not

teach a device being a blow-molded monolithic unit. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claims 21 and 22 are allowable over the applied prior art of record, and such is respectfully requested.

In view of all of the above, the Application and Claims 1-22 are now in condition for allowance and such is hereby requested.

It is respectfully requested that, if necessary to effect a timely response, this paper be considered as a Petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response and shortages in other fees be charged, or any overpayment in fees be credited, to the Account of Barnes & Thornburg LLP, Deposit Account No. 10-0435 (20341/72638).

Respectfully submitted,

  
Richard P. Krinsky  
Reg. No. 47,720  
(202) 289-1313  
BARNES & THORNBURG LLP  
Suite 900  
750 17<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006-4607

Enclosure: Amendments to the Claims